

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

1

4

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

5

TRANSCRIPT OF THE RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING held on the 1st day of May, 1996, commencing at 7:00 p.m. at Calvary Bible College, Chapel Annex, 15800 Calvary Road, Kansas City, Missouri.

RAB MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. W.V. Powell, Mr. Tom Keeney, Mr. Garey M.

Reeves, Mr. Robert Koke, Mr. Norman Onnen, Mr.

ORIGINAL Mark Esch and Mr. Robert Geller.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Dave Malecki, Mr. Wayne Mizer, Ms. Diana

Travis, Mr. Robert Lodato, Mr. Jeff Hancock and

Mr. Robert Zuiss.

1	MR. LODATO: Once again, welcome
2	everyone. My name is Robert Lodato, I'm from the
3	Air Force Base Conversion Office here at
4	Richards-Gebaur. We have Mark Esch, who is the
5	BRAC environmental coordinator for the Base, and
6	Mr. William Powell, who is the co-chair of the
7	Restoration Advisory Board. I'd like the other
8	RAB members to introduce themselves and where
9	they're from. And we do have a stenographer, so
10	we'll talk clear so she can understand us.
11	MR. GELLER: My name is Bob Geller.
12	I'm with the Missouri Department of Natural
13	Resources.
14	MR. KOKE: I'm Bob Koke with EPA.
15	MR. REEVES: I'm Garey Reeves,
16	transition coordinator.
17	MR. KEENEY: I'm Tom Keeney from
18	Belton. Just a member of the committee.
19	MR. HANCOCK: Jeff Hancock, Kansas
20	City Aviation Department.
21	MR. LODATO: We do have two new
22	faces: one is Diana Travis from the Department of
23	Natural Resources the geology department?
24	MS. TRAVIS: Right.
25	MR. LODATO: And Mr. Onnen, whom



1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	ł
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	-

25

I've never met.

MR. ONNEN: I'm from here in Belton.

MR. LODATO: Okay. Do we have any corrections to the last RAB meeting minutes? All right.

Mark Esch is going to do a little update on the environmental projects, the remediation projects that are ongoing and the planned future remediation or samplings, some of the upcoming projects that we have.

MR. ESCH: Thank you, Robert. This is an aerial photo of the Base here. For those of you that are familiar with the area, we are in this building right here. This way is north.

I've got a little close-up of the area.

I'm going to cover the BRAC Cleanup Team actions that we did between the last meeting during the last quarter. There were two tanks located in this area right here. The BRAC Cleanup Team has confirmed that those tanks are closed and are no longer issues. The work plans for site closure and/or recommendations for activities at Site 7, an underground storage tank facility right here, were approved about a month ago.

There is also another site being



investigated. There was a trench dug right along
the apron in this area here, where they had
witnessed some fuel, and that work plan to do the
work out there has been approved by the BRAC
Cleanup Team. We also did a visual site
inspection, a partial, somewhat, of some parcels
on the Base.

1.3

I'm going to throw up another slide
here. For Parcel B-6, this one right here, we did
a partial visual site inspection of that area and
the Air Force has some things to put together.
Basically, due to some transition changes within
Missouri, project managers and such, we've tabled
that particular one for right now until we get an
active project manager at our site for Missouri.
We also did a partial site inspection of Parcel E
and walked through the communications center,
which is the only building on that parcel.

As far as the Air Force activities go, we had a meeting with the Marine Corps. The property that has been designated for Marine Corps reuse is this parcel, Parcel D, B-1, E-1A, E-1B, O-1, O-2 and O-3. We discussed the memorandum of agreement on property transfer about two or three weeks ago and the Marine Corps right now is



reviewing that memorandum of agreement.

1.0

The central drainage area runs from about right here out to Corkill Road. The samples have been collected, the results are in, and there is some indication from some seeps and whatnot of up-gradient sources that are recent or active in that area, and so they are presently out here on the Base and are going to be collecting some storm water samples in this area to see if they can find the source of some contaminants they've found in the storm water.

We've had groundwater work delayed, field work delayed at four IRP sites, due to some contracting review of subcontractors, and that delay has extended the schedule for four IRP sites about two months. Those sites are the oil saturated area here on the Marine Corps property, the fire valve site here straddling the Marine property, and our Parcel B-4, the hazardous materials storage area behind 927, and the hazardous materials storage area right here on B-4.

We had a local contractor collect some samples here for some PCBs, since there was an electrical shop activity out here. We just got



the sampling report in yesterday, or Monday, and the samples indicate a non-detect for PCBs and the other parameters that were collected.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Right now -- let me throw back up this other slide. Dames & Moore has sampled the soil in the center here of the leaking underground storage tank site. They have found some petroleum contamination there. Previously the samples were collected around the perimeter of the site and did not show any significant hits. The wells have also been sampled for a dry season sample. still do not show any appreciable contamination around the site. It appears as though the contamination there of petroleum is confined to right there in that area. It is their assessment at this time that the vents were not effective for the reason that the groundwater table was so high that there was no oxidation reduction. contamination just didn't go away.

MR. REEVES: I can understand that.

MR. ESCH: So we have yet to have our discussion about where we should go from here, because at this point we have a funding opportunity to modify the contract and perhaps allow Dames & Moore to work in some type of



remedial option in that site. Of course, you know, that's probably going to be one of our discussions in the BCT meeting tomorrow, on what the options should be and what we should look at.

On the other hand, this site out here, SS08, a bunch of samples have been taken. Despite the reports, we can't find diddly. We did call the former environmental coordinator on a conference call to try to get a better feel of what was going on at that time. She did mention that 24 hours prior to the trench being opened there were some heavy rains. She did also mention that the wash rack, which is -- that plane right there is sitting on a wash rack area (indicating), was still active. They were still washing aircraft at that time, and the fuels -- wing fuel tank area was still active and they still trained sumps into that area.

It is very possible that they may have drained a sump and while the trench was open it found the lowest spot to go, rather than going down the drain, the normal -- going through the normal route, which was, as near as we can tell, the route goes from here to a pond right here, through an oil/water separator down to the Kansas



City	7 S	anitary	sewer	line	that	runs	out	this	way
out	to	Little	Blue	Valley	sewe	r dis	stric	ct.	

2.2

The asbestos survey is underway at the Base. This picture was taken today in the communications center. They have been out here for about ten days, ten working days now, collecting samples from 51-some-odd buildings out here. A general comment was, as they were going through there, that the previous asbestos survey was not very thorough, but recognizing that it was performed nine years ago it would have been good for the time.

And we've had some activity out at the POL yard. The POL yard, minus one tank, looks something like this. I had to dig out an historical photo taken in 1982 to get this, because I don't think we had any photos. There is another tank off here to this side. This tank is gone. This tank is gone. This tank is gone. This tank is gone. This tank is gone tank. It still is standing. This pump house has been demolished. And there was another pump house out here, off the screen, that was demolished, and much of the piping.

This is a photograph taken today. It's



a digital photograph of what the area looks like as of five or six hours ago. The lining is still intact around the berm. They have just done all the demolition work and removed the piping that goes to the tanks. There is another piping run that came in here on the heating oil tank, that came out here, went out this way and went to the old heating oil pump site right here. The JP-4 tank that was right here, that run went back out this way and made a few jogs back to the other pump house. That's all been removed.

1.1

1.2

1.5

1.9

JSINE: AS & ST

This is an earlier photograph from the opposite direction. The photograph that you saw was taken from the top of the Kansas City Aviation tank. This is the heating oil pump station in the process of being demolished, and some of the trenches that are being dug. The contractor, Dames & Moore, ran into a pitch-saturated mastic that had asbestos fibers in it on the piping, not only on the heating oil but also on the jet fuel piping. So they built little shelters and plastic bags to remove the pitch and the asbestos off the piping, contained all that, and then cut these pieces of pipe. So it is an intense operation. They are in the process of cutting sections of



1	pipe and wrapping every single piece of pipe up in
2	plastic and putting in a receiving landfill that
3	will accept that type of waste. Bob?
4	MR. GELLER: I guess just a
5	question. Do you plan to do any testing of that
6	mastic for PCBs? The reason I ask is because
7	recently we've identified lots of Air Force
8	installations that utilized the mastic and it
9	contained high levels of PCBs along with the
10	asbestos.
11	MR. ESCH: Anticipating that
12	question, yes.
13	MR. MIZER: It was negative.
14	MR. GELLER: You did test it for
15	PCBs? Good.
16	MR. ESCH: Any other questions about
17	this? What we anticipate to be done in the next
18	three months. Last month we had said we thought
19	that we would be writing reports on the
20	groundwater. Obviously, with a two-month delay,
21	we believe that's going to be this next quarter.
22	There is some additional central
23	drainage sampling being done in the storm sewers
24	to try to identify some of the contaminants found



in the central drainage area. That sampling will

25

be done as soon as it rains. There is a guy
camped out here waiting tonight, hoping that 30
percent chance of rain turns into 100 percent. He
flew down here on the weatherman's 70 percent
chance of rain, and made schedule, so he's hoping
for rain tonight.

RAND 4 - LUSINE COMPAS & STATE MER

Robert's going to talk a little bit more about an IRP site tour scheduled for Saturday, May the 25th. We will be doing additional sampling all over the property to establish some of the property conditions at this time through local blanket purchase agreements. We will be discussing, hopefully, the transferability of Parcel B-7. And we will have a lab tour next Wednesday with our RAB co-chairman, maybe Bob Koke.

MR. KOKE: No.

MR. ESCH: No? And we will probably have a draft work plan for the preliminary assessment and site inspection of our explosive ordnance disposal site down in Belton. That will probably be in review at MDNR and EPA during that time. And that's about it, unless anybody else knows of anything else that might be going on.

Bob?



1	MR. GELLER: Couple of questions. I
2	guess the first one is could you describe you
3	mentioned a memorandum of agreement with the
4	Marines, where I assume the property that's
5	identified in blue on your on the FOST map?
6	MR. ESCH: That's correct.
7	MR. GELLER: Can you describe what
8	that is, the memorandum of agreement? Since it's
9	an internal transfer, is that correct?
10	MR. REEVES: Let me address that.
11	MR. ESCH: Our base transition
12	coordinator can address that.
13	MR. REEVES: What this is, actually
14	we will not transfer property, as you know,
15	because all of the property belongs to the United
16	States of America. But our memorandum agreement,
17	before we allow the transfer of this property,
18	although it's a play on words, it's passing the
19	baton, so to speak, is that we want to have a
20	procedure set up to assure that the Marines have
21	agreed to accept whatever responsibilities will be
22	required, environmental responsibilities are
23	required; i.e., the funding of anything that would
24	be required for funding, and things of this
25	nature. So what our memorandum agreement is,



1 we've identified specifically -- what we said, if we get into it, and looking at -- Mark, what's 2 that site, the oil saturated right there in B --3 MR. ESCH: In B-1? 4 MR. REEVES: B-1. In that one 5 there, if there was anything additional with our 6 water sampling and everything like this, that we 7 will get through the water sampling and they have 8 to pick up that responsibility. That's what is in 9 10 our proposal on the MOA. But we've also said the fire hydrant between B-4 and 4-1, we will step up 11 12 to that because it's straddling our line and --13 which we can do, accept those responsibilities. 14 And anything that's known at the present time 15 we've tried to identify. Everything we know up to 16 this period in time, in addition to the water sampling or subsurface, you know, we've stepped up 17 18 to that because it covers the whole area. And in there we also have something to do with the --19 20 MR. LODATO: Historical. 21 MR. REEVES: -- on historical, 22 because they're getting building 602. So we've 23 tried to identify those items. Now, the Marines 24 are back looking to that because they are not 25 willing to step up to things until they know where



they're at and they know what expenses and what is
involved. I have a feeling by the time we get
through this that we will have been through the
oil saturated portion of B-1, we will know all the
things we have on that, and identify basically
whatever needs to be identified. If there's
anything that like B-1, that oil saturated,
would require additional action, I'm sure that
that would delay the Marines agreement to sign
that MOA.

MR. GELLER: I guess from the State's standpoint, and as is visible on the map, the State has not concurred that those areas are suitable for transfer to any authority, if Kansas City were requesting B-1, E-1, the building complex, any of those areas, we would not accept that, would not allow that at this time. They could lease it, but the State has not accepted those areas as being suitable for transfer, such that we have on A-1 and B-2, identified that everything we think needs to be completed out there is done, if there is anything.

So my question is: Who will be the responsible party addressing the cleanup issues or investigation issues? And the second part of that



is: Will the State and/or EPA have an opportunity to review and comment or accept your memorandum of agreement with the Marines? Because we will not allow you to transfer the property to anyone else.

MR. REEVES: That's right. But this is going to remain Department of Defense, and that will be our position. We'll certainly let you see a copy of the MOA, but I would say right at the present time that you would probably not have final approval authority on that MOA. But I will provide what we've provided to them so you can see. And we'll certainly take into consideration any questions, and I would certainly like to try to escalate that question to get an answer that's a little above my pay grade.

But again, as I said, this is no longer

-- this is not a BRAC issue, as we discussed last
time. At least this is the Air Force's position.

Because it's not something that was agreed by the
BRAC commission, this was a service transfer of
property which was agreed within the service by
the Secretary of Defense. So it remains, again,
still the same owner that it was before, all it is
is a different color uniform.



1	MR. GELLER: But you're saying it is
2	not part of BRAC?
3	MR. REEVES: It is not part of BRAC.
4	MR. GELLER: Therefore it can't be
5	covered by the reuse, transfer, or anything else.
6	MR. REEVES: Exactly.
7	MR. GELLER: BRAC funds. And can't
8	be used by closure of the Base.
9	MR. ESCH: It's the opinion of our
10	legal counsel in Washington that it can't, because
11	there is it states specifically in the law that
12	there has to be a deed transfer occur.
13	MR. GELLER: Okay. I'll request a
14	copy of that legal opinion. We've asked for that
15	in the past. It's the State's position that that
16	is Air Force's responsibility. It was a BRAC Air
17	Force Base closure. We're going to continue to
18	come to the Air Force as the responsible party to
19	address those sites. That's the way we've been
2 0	requested to do so by the Air Force, was to
21	address all the issues with Base Conversion
22	Agency, and that's the way we're continuing to do
23	it.
24	MR. ESCH: We'll go forward to,



again, those people above our pay grade and ask

25

for that legal determination and request a letter be written.

MR. GELLER: Okay.

MR. REEVES: A good example that brought this all to a head, you're probably somewhat familiar with Carswell? Well, Carswell Air Force Base, for the board here, Carswell Air Force Base was on the '91 hit list and it was to be closed. Navy Dallas Air Station, located in Dallas, was not on that hit list. Navy Dallas went forward and asked for permission to be able to transfer and give up Navy Dallas and take over Carswell because Carswell was -- if you've ever been on a Navy facility you'll find out Air Force facilities usually are far above Navy facilities. They put their money in ships. Anyhow, they wanted to move over to take over the Air Force's facility. That was approved.

When that was approved, though, basically all the arguments the Air Force had for closing Carswell -- these were good arguments, because the Air Force said the housing -- a good example is that the housing was not up to par and things of this nature. The Navy was willing to accept that housing because it's probably better



1	than the ones they had. So they got into an
2	argument about how that's going to be settled.
3	And that property that will be retained by the
4	Navy will have to be cleaned up they still have
5	to be cleaned up to whatever legal level, but will
6	be cleaned up other than BRAC funds, will be
7	cleaned up in what we call DERA funds, because it
8	would have been cleaned up had the Air Force
9	remained there, okay? So it will be cleaned up
10	under DERA versus BRAC.
11	And that's basically what's brought all
12	of these things to a head and what they're talking

And that's basically what's brought all of these things to a head and what they're talking about there in BRAC monies. We have no argument with -- the bottom line is DoD is going to spend the money to clean this property up, and so we could just go forward, again, and try to get something. And I think really where our problem is on this one here, this one is an Air Force, we need a DoD decision out.

MR. ESCH: And that basically ends my discussion. I believe we have --

MR. REEVES: One other question,

Mark. What is the two green spots?

MR. ESCH: Where are we at?

MR. REEVES: Well, A-1 and B-2; what



are	they?

MR. ESCH: The green? This is property that the BRAC Cleanup Team at this time feels is ready to transfer. We have A-1 out here. Any property within this area is ready to transfer. Any property within B-2 is ready to transfer and C is ready to transfer. We are still looking at areas in the brown at this time. One of the areas that MDNR said is ready to transfer is the NDI shop. Air Force believes it's ready to transfer, and EPA has a package that we delivered last week and they are reviewing it at this time to see if they also believe that it is ready to transfer.

MR. GELLER: We're also looking at the blue areas in addition to the brown. Still have some questions.

MR. LODATO: The next item. Mr. Jeff Hancock from Kansas City Aviation is going to give us a presentation on what the City plans on doing, future reuse of the property once it is turned over to them.

MR. HANCOCK: Okay. Very good.

This is going to be pretty informal and I don't have any overhead slides, but I'll be happy to



answer any questions you would have. I do have little handouts, though, for everybody, so we can pass that out. That kind of gives an overall picture as far as where we are at, looks at the properties, it examines also some of the interim leases that we've had. So feel free to ask any questions about anything.

It's amazing we've been working on this for three years. It's been an exciting project for me. I'll give you a little bit of background about myself. My background was city management and I came over from the city manager's office into aviation to work on Richards-Gebaur, and since that time I've become assistant aviation director for commercial development, and I'm responsible for all the leases and contracts for all three airports.

This map gives you an idea. Most of you realize that this is really the second transfer that we've gone through. The first transfer started in 1976, and it was even a longer time period to get the title of the property back then. In 1985 we acquired title to 1350 acres, including the airfield, and we were in the airport business. But the Air Force did retain approximately 242



acres, which are those areas that are colored.

The Air Force station was here, and then we all know that they left and went on to Whiteman Air Force Base.

We have been involved in the redevelopment reuse study. That study was really two phases. The first phase included a data base as far as all of the properties. Phase 2 got into exactly what we are going to do with the properties, and that is really the driving force as far as where we are at. In that planning process we involved the surrounding communities of Grandview, Belton, South Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, and we provided public participation opportunities and hearings.

One of the exciting things that I think came out of that second phase of that reuse study was that the market conditions were analyzed in this area. It involved looking at the national and regional economic activity and demographics. It did a comparison of the industries and an examination of the development potential was undertaken. What came out of that was really a targeted industry type of format which really highlighted what the strength of this area is.



Some of those strengths are the fact that it's an excellent transportation area. just goes without saying that Kansas City in itself is an excellent transportation area, but this spot here, with the rail and the highway access, and the airport access, highlights the fact that distribution activities are a targeted industry, warehousing, light manufacturing, pharmaceutical and veterinarian supplies. And I don't have a whole list of that targeted industry, but that has been developed. Some of the conclusions of the reuse plan indicated -- well, let me back up. Prior to when we had the first closure

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

we did look at a plan and we developed what was called, for some of you people that have been here a while, the South Port plan. And what that plan envisioned was really an office warehouse park type of an arrangement, and by that it would be a showroom type atmosphere, office warehouse is the best way, you would come in and you would see, oh, automobiles, or -- it was more of a commercial type activity. Well, one of the things that came out of the plan was the fact that that plan was really outdated, and that based upon that type of



3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

divided into aeronautical and nonaeronautical. The blue is aeronautical, the green is the nonaeronautical. And you have to realize what type of transfer this Since the old transfers they have come up with a type of transfer called an economic development transfer. I won't go into all the details, but one of the conclusions of our study was the fact that a public benefit transfer through FAA was the most appropriate type of transfer. And what happens on that is that FAA makes a determination that this land is suitable for airport purposes. The aeronautical piece is the area which is specifically for airport activity and the nonaeronautical piece can be other activities, but the purpose is to generate

Let's see here. One of the things that we found in the study was the fact that the Marines -- we actively worked with the Marines and

revenue to support the airport.



their acquisition of those 17 buildings would be a
positive attraction for the redevelopment plan.
One of the things that we were concerned about was
a generation of activity. And the Marines you
know, if the Marines were not here we would have
even less activity than we have right now.

1.5

So although there are some questions, as was highlighted before about the Marines, and we have raised some questions since then about that, about the Marines' presence, it's in fact some questions that we are going to raise higher up, because we have found that funding from BRAC funds to support the operations of the airport is not available. We had gone to the Marines to look for some financial support and their statutes indicate that that's not allowable. And we are exploring legislative activity to change that. We do know that that's a problem in some of the other bases that perhaps wasn't considered in the BRAC situation.

The other thing that we noticed in our plan was the fact that the large warehouse building does have some revenue potential. That's building 610. The aeronautical buildings have revenue potential, but the other smaller buildings



really do not have much revenue potential and that

it would be best that they would be demolished,

and that's currently in our plans.

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Current status, where we are at. I mentioned to you the fact of the FAA public benefit transfer. What you have to do is make application to FAA for a record of decision, and that has been submitted. That has been approved by FAA. Our application, all hook, line and sinker, was accepted, including the personal property request that was listed.

So where we are at is basically we are waiting to have the Air Force do the environmental on the properties. And I think our final deadline that we're looking at is October. We're hopeful that it could happen quicker than that. But what will happen is that we would obtain a long-term lease arrangement and when all of the environmental situations are taken care of then we would obtain actual title. We're hoping that the areas you talked about that you've examined could go to actual title. You're aware of the fact that the Department of Army is looking to get the 184 acres from the Air Force. The Marine Corps would get 54 acres. And we would receive approximately



1 | 178 acres.

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What we have done in the interim, however, is used interim leases. Those areas that are circled are the areas that we have initiated and completed interim leases. I can highlight some of those for you. 839, up in the left-hand upper corner, is Missouri Aviation, which has aircraft type maintenance potential. 100 and 101, I hope you can see those, that's the next circle moving into the blue area. One of those is the tower, which we leased ourselves, and the other was the fire station. The Kansas City Fire Department has moved their fire department over into that area. 918, the large warehouse -- or large hangar facility, is currently leased with Million Air, South Port Aviation.

large warehouse that we're talking about, that is leased with Zimmer Company. Zimmer is a large developer in Kansas City who has done a lot of industrial parks: Air World Center and -- I say a lot, probably three or four. Air World Center up near KCI and also over in Lenexa, the name -- it slips me right now. They are also highly active in the economic development activity for the



REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS

state, working with Utilicorp, for example, on
economic development activities. The arrangement
there is that after the improvements are made that
we will share in the leasing, a percentage of
that. So it truly is a public/private
relationship that we're really excited about.

The other buildings highlighted are 958 and 931. That's an interim lease that we're working with -- help me out -- United Sports of America. United Sports of America is active in the airshow. And this last year we had our first private airshow, another example of good public/private relationship. And it went very well I think. Dave could probably in a little bit talk about the airshow and what's coming up this summer, but for the first go around it was just tremendous. And we think that that airshow generates activity and excitement for Richards-Gebaur and we're real pleased with that.

Let me see here. See what other items do we have. 927 is a building that we're going to use for our department here for the management and maintenance facility. As far as the flight line goes, we did put together an RFP for the hangar facilities that went nationwide. Unfortunately,



we did not receive very much activity on that. We only received one quote on two of those hangars, and that was the existing airport -- or FBO that's located here. And I'll talk a little bit later about some of the financial concerns that we have.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Currently we are concluding our developer arrangement with Zimmer Company. are different phases of that agreement. The first phase really is what we are going to implement Zimmer Company really is an expert in industrial parks. And we soon realized that we aren't in the business of industrial parks and we're in the business of running airports. what we are going to use Zimmer for, and that arrangement should be going to counsel within the next week or two, they will look at the total airport, the total area, and develop the necessary plan to combine all aspects of it. The cost will be to the point of 10 percent plus or minus. that we'll have a situation so that if anyone wanted to come in, two things: one, they'd know the exact cost for what it would be to develop it; and, secondly, they could see the whole picture.

And I don't have a diagram of that, but it calls for use of the golf course, some public



REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS

PO BOX 4589 • OVERLAND PARK KS 66204

amenities, covenants and restrictions on the property. So we are excited about that. Other things that it includes would be a marketing plan, coordination with the Kansas City Economic Development Corporation and the other economic development corporations around, and also commissions from the standpoint of actually leasing or selling the property.

The second and third phase, which we have not elected to implement, would include also a possibility of managing the properties, because they're experts in that, and secondly an actual development whereby the developer, and this could be Zimmer or somebody else, could actually pull a piece of property out, put in the investment through private funds, public funds, however, but primarily because we are limited on funds it would be private, but put that in, and then the rents that would come in the future would help pay for those improvements and then we would share in a private/public relationship some of the rents.

As I indicated to you, we're in the business of running airports and not really experts on economic development of industrial parks. Some of the things that have created



concern and has been a challenge to us is the fact that, from the air side, is that the federal government through these closures of bases are dumping -- maybe that's not the correct term, but are putting a tremendous amount of airfields and aeronautical support facilities onto the market. What that has done is, because there's so much supply, it has lowered the price for those. And, as we all know from the aeronautical side, general aviation has been relatively flat. It hasn't been a growing situation. The airlines have just been coming out of a slow time period. So we are competing with a lot of other airfields all across the nation, and so that creates a concern.

The second thing that is a concern is the fact that just in the local area the general aviation demand is exceeded by excess capacity.

Just in this area we have some other airports.

Over in Kansas we have New Century Airport, we have Executive Airport. We have Lee's Summit that's close. So that is a real challenge for us.

We have to compete for the aircraft that is already based at other airports. And again, with general aviation being fairly flat, it creates a concern for us.



Let's see. We do have a lot of
strengths, however, as I've alluded to: the
location, the great transportation facilities. We
are in a state enterprise zone. Properties have
been advertised through the state in an I-Net type
program. It's being advertised nationally through
what's called The Parcels I-Net program. We are
currently advertising in Sites, Plants & Parks,
which is the economic development magazine. We'll
be in the Directory of Area Development. We're
advertising.
We have had, with the help of Zimmer,

2.3

have had some fairly significant industries that have looked at this property. And I can assure you that -- it's Mr. Driscoll, isn't it? -- the gentleman in the state economic development is well aware of this location. The enterprise zone is a tremendous asset. So we're excited, basically, about the opportunity. I think I'll wrap up, really, with that. And think I've given a good thumbnail sketch and would answer any questions that you might have.

MR. ESCH: I have one question.

MR. HANCOCK: Sure.

MR. ESCH: Mayor Cleaver did



REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS

basically go on record as having a distaste for business incentives but realized it was part of the game to get business into Kansas City. Has his office addressed anything in the way of business incentives to pull anything into the air park arena?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. HANCOCK: Sure. When I alluded to some of those industries that we've talked to, the full gamut of those incentives were looked at. And we're pretty competitive, I think, the City of Kansas City, as far as playing in that game. Economic Development Corporation is working hand-in-hand with us. And, as we all know, for example Harley Davidson was a recent one that was accomplished for Kansas City. And my understanding was that Harley Davidson was looking at this area, too. So, point being, we're right in the middle of that activity. And we think that through the use of the Zimmer Company dealing on a private-to-private basis that that gives us another added opportunity.

So, as far as the whole issue of incentives on a regional basis, you know about as much as what I've read in the paper, but I do know that we're as competitive as anybody. And the



1	state enterprise zone is a tremendous benefit.
2	There aren't very many economic enterprise zones
3	in the state.
4	MR. POWELL: Is there any enterprise
5	zones on there, basically?
6	MR. HANCOCK: All of it. It's all
7	in the state enterprise zone. And what that does
8	is enables tax credits for training and
9	MR. POWELL: I was on the original
10	committee that got the enterprise zone in Kansas
11	City.
12	MR. HANCOCK: Okay. So, yes, the
13	whole airfield is there. One of the things from
14	the economic development situation that we're
15	really interested in is the improvement of Highway
16	150. That was one of the areas that was mentioned
17	in the plan, and we've been working with Grandview
18	and Belton to try to see that that takes place.
19	MR. ESCH: I recall that from was
20	it the Austin Company, that they made a point of
21	saying that until it gets put into the 10-year
22	plan that was an element. Has it or has it not at
23	this point?
24	MR. HANCOCK: It is in the plan and



we have -- I personally have lobbied in front of

25

the highway commission to upgrade it and move it
up even further with the South Kansas City Chamber
of Commerce. We've made presentations. The
problem with the State at the present time is that
they are a little short on funds on the existing
program that they worked on. In fact, they were
going to the legislature to try to do a bonding
type thing to upgrade some of the projects and
that didn't go anywhere with the legislature. I
do think, though, as I indicated to you before,
that as competitive as we are, that if there was a
need I think you know, a prospect, that in my
opinion that if there was a real need for Highway
150 that it could move up higher than what it is
right now. That's just my personal opinion.

1.

One of the -- I alluded to this before, that from the Marine standpoint it is kind of interesting, from the standpoint that the Marines are part of our whole industrial park but they are a separate entity surrounded by us. By the park. And one of the things that people don't realize is that the Kansas City Aviation Department is self-sufficient. It generates all of its revenues itself. And where some people would think that general fund taxes could come in here and do



certain things, that's not necessarily the case.

We have to pay our own way. We have to pay for

the streets and security and all of that, just

like we do at KCI or downtown airport.

That's why we're real interested in the possibilities of getting legislation to perhaps get some funding from the Marines, because they are inside this park and they are using some of our facilities, and unlike the Air Force where we had a joint use agreement in the past when they were here, the Reserves were here, and they paid for the steam, they paid for the tower, ran all of the ILS equipment.

There is light at the end of the tunnel. In the short-run I think it's going to be tough for the next five or ten years, but in the long-run we're going to be okay because we've got a tremendous facility and the land space is good, and in the long-run it will be okay. But in the short-run it will be tough. But we did lose I think approximately \$1.9 million of support from the Air Force by them leaving. And so that creates a challenge, but we're up to it.

MR. GELLER: Couple of quick questions. I guess the first one would be in your



building legend here it says "Buildings to

demolish on KC Missouri side." Are you talking

about Missouri side when you actually obtain the

property after transfer? Is that what that is

indicating? The red.

MR. HANCOCK: Yeah, that's the plan, and that would be depending upon our funding capabilities. I notice one of them, 931, is circled to be demolished, but that's probably just a mistake. But, yeah, this will be a really beautiful facility, and one of the things we don't want is we don't want some of the older, smaller buildings to become in disrepair and look bad. And so we think that it's better to demolish those buildings.

MR. GELLER: Part of the reason in my asking that is from our standpoint if there are any of these buildings that you plan to demolish, if we can minimize the amount of environmental surveys that we're looking at, as far as under some of the reuse plans those were identified to possibly be remaining. You know, we would strongly support the effort to not have to study these buildings to death if there actually are plans to demolish them and not continue to use



1	them. It would be a waste of funds. So I don't
2	know whether that's
3	MR. ESCH: Yeah, if it's in the
4	commercial zone and it's going to be demolished
5	anyway, you know, we have to take a look at it,
6	you know, is it going to be used for a day-care
7	center or something like that.
8	MR. HANCOCK: Oh, yeah. Well, sure.
9	They are on the market, you know, and that's not
10	to say that, for example, building 105, which is
11	at the corner here, if we had a commercial
12	operation we'd use it. But it's just
13	MR. GELLER: An option?
14	MR. HANCOCK: Yeah, an option,
15	really.
16	MR. GELLER: I guess the only other
17	thing I would add is based on all the discussions
18	this evening, based partly on your presentation
19	and Garey's, are we going to extend a specific
20	invitation to the Marines to participate in this
21	process? They have not been involved in it, and
22	from the State standpoint, or EPA, I don't know
23	that we've ever had any discussions with them.
24	MR. REEVES: That's part of the MOA,



is that they participate.

MR. GELLER: I guess what I'm asking is before, regardless of the decision whether the Marines are going to take over or not, they are a key player in the whole reuse scenario and the environmental questions.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUSINE

MR. REEVES: They have been extended for the last year and a half, okay? And right today I think Mr. Herd, he gets noticed, and their representatives get noticed each time just like we do.

MR. GELLER: I quess my concern is that we don't -- based on their response we see very little effort from the Marines to try to facilitate a clean transfer. I mean, the Air Force has stepped up and tried to work with the State and EPA to move this property to a commercial reuse, which is exactly what Congress intended. It's not a fun process, but it's a process that we all need to go through to make sure the property is as clean as necessary so it can be transferred for whatever the next use is. And I guess the Marines are -- if in fact it's being realigned, as opposed to closed, then the Marines need to step up and I guess provide their fair share of the effort and support.



1	MR. HANCOCK: And I don't want to
2	give the wrong presentation or misrepresentation.
3	We have had discussions with the Marines and we've
4	had an open type of communication.
5	MR. GELLER: And once again, I don't
6	either, because they've done a fine job building
7	some new facilities in there, bringing additional
8	funds to this area, but at the same time our hope
9	is that we can facilitate the environmental
10	component of it so we can let you folks get on
11	with your business of redeveloping this area.
12	MR. HANCOCK: We do have a
13	legitimate question from the standpoint that they
14	are like an island, and they are part of the total
15	industrial park and air park, and so we have to
16	have good communication on a lot of different
17	issues, and environmental is one of them.
18	MR. POWELL: I have one more
19	question. Here it says "Buildings to Belton,"
20	which appears to be around three buildings up
21	there in the center of the property that they
22	apparently own. Do these buildings now actually
23	belong to Belton or what is the
24	MR. HANCOCK: Well, I can probably
25	comment on some of it and then Mr. Reeves could



comment. They originally I believe wanted to -they wanted to negotiate a sale. And I think that
those negotiations --

1.8

MR. REEVES: The City of Kansas

City, the local reuse authority, supported

Belton's request to buy that property under

negotiated sales, and they were offered the

negotiated sales, but a negotiated sale is based

on appraised value. And a negotiated sale versus

public sale is that being it's a public entity

that we can go to them without going out to

anybody else. Okay? So that's why we could go to

them. Belton's offer was less than the appraised

value. Considerably less. So after going back

and forth several times on that, Belton decided to

decline.

And so our next step is to go to public sale. However, we've held that in abeyance for a while in the consideration that one time the Army Reserve had some interest in that, and we thought that they might have an interest in it because they have a rather large motor fleet. We don't think that that's going to happen. However, until we get a clean bill of health from everybody on the thing, there's no sense of us pushing the



1.	public sale. At least that's why I haven't
1.	
2	brought it up again. You know, if we get a clean
3	bill of health then we'll go out to public sale.
4	The public sale might come in and sell for a
5	dollar, but the highest bidder gets what it is
6	then.
7	MR. POWELL: One question. Since
8	you've apparently limited the air restriction
9	around those buildings, does this increase the
10	value of those buildings?
11	MR. REEVES: Well, no. It decreased
12	the value of those buildings, in a matter of
13	speaking, because those buildings owned the
14	easement, and the easement was value, which
15	decreased in Belton had the advantage of a
16	lesser fee when they bought that property which
17	they did buy, because it had that restriction on
18	it. And Congress always reduces the value of the
19	property further. So, if anything, it reduced the
20	value of those buildings.
21	MR. POWELL: If the Belton paper is
22	right you fellows have released that easement.
23	They don't have that air easement any more. Is
24	that right or not?



I haven't seen that

MR. REEVES:

1	officially myself.
2	MR. POWELL: I just read the paper.
3	MR. REEVES: I understand. I read
4	the paper, too. We haven't seen it. Now, I will
5	tell you this, I requested a release of easement
6	around this and I also requested a release off of
7	the range here, this 22-acre easement off this
8	range.
9	MR. POWELL: Off of where now?
10	MR. REEVES: Off of this area, 1040.
11	So there was 22 acres and I request the easement
12	on that, and I haven't received any notification
13	on it either. I really think it's in the process.
14	MR. POWELL: Somebody must be
15	getting word it's been approved in this.
16	MR. REEVES: I haven't received it.
17	I read it in Belton and I went forward to asking
18	them is this correct.
19	MR. POWELL: Read the paper. It
20	says you've released it. So to me that makes that
21	property worth more money.
22	MR. REEVES: Well, all I'm trying to
23	say is, you know, I think it's semantics, that the
24	value of that easement went with these buildings.



If you've released the

MR. POWELL:

1	easement then there isn't any.
2	MR. REEVES: But even on our
3	negotiated sales we had cut that off because we
4	knew we were taking it off.
5	MR. POWELL: I guess I don't
6	understand. If you've taken it off then it's not
7	there any more, is that right?
8	MR. REEVES: Well, that's right. We
9	knew that we were taking it off, because we said
10	to go out there we decided to drop that. Had
11	we not decided to drop it, we had sold that
12	property, we'd take that easement off, somebody
13	could have sold it to the City of Belton so much
14	an acre to remove the easement. See what I'm
15	saying? But we elected to take it off, as we did
16	with Kansas City, because we're in the business of
17	trying to get rid of the airport and make what's
18	good for Kansas City and the local community.
19	MR. POWELL: Okay. That's all the
20	questions I have.
21	MR. HANCOCK: Anything else? Yeah,
22	Norman?
23	MR. ONNEN: The leases and the
24	ownerships of the property, are those in keeping



with the adopted reuse plan? Do they follow the

1	reuse plan or have you deviated from that?
2	MR. HANCOCK: Yes, they follow the
3	reuse plan. Yes. I was trying to think if there
4	was any that yes. I was thinking of United
5	Sports, but really that's just a storage type
6	arrangement.
7	MR. MALECKI: That lease is
8	coincidental with our airshow producer's
9	agreement, so when they are no longer producer
10	then that lease will end.
11	MR. ONNEN: The property that the
12	Marine Corps is keeping and taking over, was that
13	part of the reuse plan?
14	MR. HANCOCK: Yes, it was. We
15	supported the Marines and worked with the Marines.
16	We incorporated that into our reuse plan. We may
17	have made some modifications later on, in keeping
18	with the reuse plan, for them to take additional
19	properties. And we view that as advantageous from
20	the standpoint of two things: One is that it
21	generates activity here; and, secondly, it reduces
22	our operation maintenance costs for those
23	facilities.
24	MR. ONNEN: Then one other question.



What are the projections for building 612?

1	MR. HANCOCK: 612. Which one is
2	612? Help me.
3	MR. ESCH: 610? The warehouse?
4	MR. KEENEY: 610 is the yellow
5	building out there in middle of Parcel B-2.
6	MR. ESCH: Concrete block
7	manufacturing.
8	MR. HANCOCK: Oh, that was yeah.
9	See, that's not in the the only part that's in
10	the reuse is the colored areas. That was during
11	the last transfer. And that is industrial, I
12	think, activity. Dave might want to comment.
13	Dave is the airport representative. Do you want
14	to comment on any activities or on the airshow?
15	MR. MALECKI: We've had a lot of
16	interest to show buildings and show property.
17	We've had various groups contact us, some of them
18	wanting little pieces of property and some wanting
19	larger pieces. We are aggressively trying to work
20	those leads out. The airshow lease is being
21	processed through Garey's office to be able to
22	have the airshow July 27 and 28. We wanted to go
23	ahead and process that lease in the event that we
24	do not get the long-term lease that Jeff was



If we don't get the long-term

speaking about.

1	lease we've got a lease to put on the alishow. If
2	we do get a long-term lease it's a moot issue, but
3	at any rate we're able to run the airshow.
4	MR. HANCOCK: And we do have the
5	Thunderbirds?
6	MR. MALECKI: The Thunderbirds, Red
7	Baron Pizza Air Team, the Golden Knights, probably
8	about six or seven other civilian acts. About
9	every military aircraft you can think of. About
10	45 static aircraft. The second run of an airshow
11	that was relatively successful last year, for the
12	first airshow we charged people to attend, and I
13	think it will be better this year and get better
14	the next three years. We have a five-year
15°	agreement with this producer to run airshows, and
16	getting smarter every day.
17	MR. HANCOCK: Okay. Well, I'll sit
18	down.
19	MR. KEENEY: Jeff, you've got a
20	small lake out there right beside the south end of
21	the runway. Have you considered floating a casino
22	on that?
23	MR. HANCOCK: That would pay some
24	bills.
25	MR. KEENEY: Finance the whole bit.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ESCH: As long as it's not too tall the FAA wouldn't have any problem with it.

MR. KEENEY: All you have to have is Missouri River water, and you can pump that into Kansas City's line.

MR. HANCOCK: My only question would be it's probably like -- it's a supply and demand factor, just like airports. Maybe we might have too much supply.

MR. REEVES: I'd just like to say, as we talk about these leases and everything, that I'd just like to give a lot of thanks to the State of Missouri and EPA, because it's very important that they sign off on these Environmental Baseline Study Supplementals that's necessary so we can process these leases. And as we get into the airshow event, the final on that, and of course the faster we will a long-term lease, and once we can get to that it will be good for all of us, because it will be over with. But they're very key to this. And they're very loaded, they've lost a lot of people down there, and so I just want to thank you for doing that.

MR. HANCOCK: And I'd like to second that, because when we get a prospect, for us to be

1	competitive, we have to move rather quickly. And
2	we appreciate the help that we've gotten.
3	MR. ESCH: On this map I notice that
4	you have "New leases at R-G." I assume that's the
5	leases that you have leased out to people.
6	MR. HANCOCK: That's right.
7	MR. ESCH: And it doesn't identify
8	the areas that you have leased from us?
9	MR. HANCOCK: Oh, every one of those
10	we have leased from you and then subleased.
11	MR. ESCH: Well, I mean in addition
12	to the ones that you're using, like 1025, the
13	tower
14	MR. HANCOCK: Oh, yeah. Well, I
15	should have made a note that we have a lease on
16	all the aeronautical.
17	MR. MALECKI: All the aeronautical
18	parts were leased from the Air Force in 1994,
19	October, to allow us to take over the ILS system
20	and control tower operations, all the markers and
21	all of those little pieces that are islands out
22	there. And we'll continue to lease those until we
23	can receive the property.
24	MR. LODATO: Thanks, Jeff. Very
25	informative. I believe it's always nice to get a



different viewpoint on what's actually going on out here. There's a lot of things happening and you miss a lot getting involved in other projects.

Mark had mentioned the site tour. I have some personal commitments coming up here in the next couple of weeks, but tentatively scheduled for the 25th. I'm close to making arrangements to get some vehicles from the Army, to use one of their buses, so we can all ride around. What I'm going to do is send out a flier. Personally, I don't think we're going to get the participation or the interest, but we're going to give it our best shot.

MR. ESCH: Bring your families.

MR. HANCOCK: What time will that

be?

MR. LODATO: We'll schedule it for probably around noon. That seems to be a fair time. We can get the tour in, we can do what we have to do, and that will allow enough time for people to get home.

I've got another comment on the Belton Training Complex. The contractor working for AFRES, SAIC, is anticipating being awarded the contract this Friday and being out to begin



grubbing work and get the project started on the week of the 13th of this month. We'll be meeting with DNR to discuss the part X permit to see how we're going to dispose of any ordnance that's found. Paula Shepherd's been in contact with you, and hopefully will be in contact with us, so we know what the time schedule is on that.

Any other comments? The next scheduled RAB meeting is August the 7th, seven o'clock, here.

MR. ONNEN: I'm not receiving the mailing on the minutes.

MR. LODATO: The last mailing on all the minutes from the last RAB were all sent to the RAB members. And your name was included on that list. So I've got your current address. Because you had talked to Mr. Reeves prior to that and I specifically made sure that yours was on the mailing list. But I'll go back and check.

MR. KEENEY: The last meeting we had here in the summertime was terrible. There's plenty of room in the old City Hall in Belton, and I'm sure that Bill and I, between us, could get that for you if you'd like to go there. It's a nice building, air-conditioned, and plenty of



I, LYNN R. HICKS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Kansas, do hereby certify that I appeared at the time and place

shorthand the entire proceedings had at said time and place, and that the foregoing constitutes a

first hereinbefore set forth, that I took down in

CERTIFICATE

true, correct, and complete transcript of my said

shorthand notes.

Lynn R. Hicks, CSR



1	room, unless you have a much, much bigger crowd
2	than you've got. If you'd be interested.
3	MR. LODATO: Past history tells us
4	we're not going to get any larger of a crowd than
5	this. My personal preference is to keep it here
6	for continuity. But I'll concur I'll concede
7	to the wishes and we'll schedule the next meeting
8	at the old Belton City Hall.
9	MR. KEENEY: Well, we have to be
10	sure the date's open.
11	MR. LODATO: Right.
12	MR. KEENEY: We'll get back to you.
13	It might be busy. I doubt it, don't you?
14	MR. POWELL: I don't think so.
15	MR. LODATO: And hopefully after the
16	meeting Mr. Powell will take us for a ride in
17	Carry Nation's carriage around town.
18	MR. POWELL: I can do that.
19	MR. LODATO: Do we have any other
20	comments? With that I'd like to adjourn. And I
21	thank you all for attending. We appreciate your
22	participation.
23	
24	

